

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 59-77 are pending. New claims 59-77 are hereby added. Claims 1-58 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 59, 67, and 75-77 are independent. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, and specifically at pages 61-65 and Figures 69A and 69B.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 56 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the present Amendment obviates this rejection. Claim 76 is directed to a computer-readable medium, and is therefore statutory.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 9-15, 26-28, 35-39, 50-52, and 54, and 56-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully submit that the present Amendment obviates this rejection. Independent

claims 59, 67, and 75-77 recited the method steps as required by the Office Action, and are enabled by pages 61-65 in the Specification and Figures 69A and 69B in the Drawings.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9-15, 26-28, 35-39, 50-52, 54, and 56-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,393,469 to Dozier et al. (hereinafter, merely “Dozier”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,724,595 to Gentner (hereinafter, merely “Gentner”).

Claim 58 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Dozier in view Gentner and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,208 to Dutta (hereinafter, merely “Dutta”).

As understood by Applicants, Dozier relates to the critical needs of publishers seeking to create and publish hypermedia content in electronic form across wide area networks such as the World Wide Web. Toward that end, a client-server development platform is provided for handling the functions of document authoring, content-based indexing and retrieval of documents, management and control of proprietary assets, and support for developing form-driven interactive services, all in a manner that is uniquely and seamlessly WAN-integrated.

As understood by Applicants, Gentner relates to an improved method and system for creating a link in an original hypertext document to a target hypertext document when a link creating icon is dragged from the target hypertext document to a specified location in the original hypertext document. The title of the target hypertext document is inserted at the link text.

As understood by Applicants, Dutta enables content producers to selectively choose which content distributors may hyperlink to the content producer's website. The content producer provides an initial URL referencing a document on the content producer server to the

content distributor. The content distributor creates an HTML file that contains the initial hyperlink URL that was given to the content distributor. The content distributor allows the content producer the privilege of updating the HTML file containing the initial hyperlink URL. The content producer may periodically access the content distributor server to replace the hyperlink with a new URL reference to the document. Because the hyperlink referring to a document is modified at the will of the content producer, the content producer controls the entities that can hyperlink to the document. As a side effect, the content producer may also determine which content distributor referred a client and may also keep records of such referral.

Claim 59 recites, *inter alia*:

**“... requesting the owners of the selected companies
refer back to the website; and**

**generating one or more referral pages for those owners
that have elected to refer back to the website.”**

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing has been found in Dozier, Gentner, or Dutta, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 59. Specifically, neither Dozier, Gentner, nor Dutta, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest requesting the owners of the selected companies refer back to the website. In addition, the applied combination does not teach or suggest generating one or more referral pages for those owners that have elected to refer back to the website, all as recited in claim 59.

Applicants' former representative, Peter Withstandley (Reg. No. 53,784), conducted a telephone interview with Examiner Campbell on May 16, 2006 regarding the outstanding rejection of this application. The Examiner acknowledged that the Gentner reference describes a system for creating a link from a newly created page to a target page and does not describe placing a link on a target page linking to a newly created page. The Examiner

indicated that clarifying the language of the present invention would make the claims allowable over the combination of Dozier and Gentner.

Applicants have presented independent claims 59, 67, and 75-77 in order to more clearly define Applicants' invention. In particular these claims have been presented to indicate that "requesting the owners of the selected companies refer back to the website; and generating one or more referral pages for those owners that have elected to refer back to the website," as recited in claim 59.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 59 is patentable.

Independent claims 67 and 75-77 are similar, or somewhat similar, in scope and are therefore patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance
and request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Agents for Applicants

By

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. G. Brown', written over a horizontal line.

Daniel G. Brown
Reg. No. 54,005
(212) 588-0800